

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-21 are pending in the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner states that the “rejection is retained as to the non-systemic criticality”. The stated object of the present application as recited on page 4 of the specification thereof is to provide an effective animal barrier protection mixture that remains on surface. The criticality of providing a mixture that remains on surface, in other words one that acts non-systemically, is twofold. On the one hand, the mixture of the present application avoids the drawback of transdermal absorption of the active ingredient into the animal, and hence possible entry into the human food chain (see page 3 of applicants’ specification, lines 13 and 14). Furthermore, the mixture as defined in applicants’ Claims 1 and 12 will provide for contact with all pests of concern, thus avoiding another drawback of the prior art, namely being able to effectively deal with pests that are non blood sucking (see, for example, the discussion on page 3 of applicants’ specification, lines 7 – 12). It is therefore respectfully submitted that applicants have more than adequately presented the criticality of providing a mixture where the pesticide acts non-systemically.

As required by applicants’ Claims 1 and 12, the pesticide acts or operates non-systemically relative to a host animal. This is a critical limitation of the Claims as discussed above. Further, a non-systemic environment is brought about by the